LeCours, Catherine

From:	Carnes, Patricia [Patricia.Carnes@volpe.dot.gov]
Sent:	Tuesday, January 16, 2007 2:38 PM
To:	LeCours, Catherine
Cc:	Mccomb.Martin@epamail.epa.gov; Crowell, Terry
Subject:	TAPE forms
Importance:	High
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Red

Catherine,

The Libby field folks looked at the forms for the new PDA that Marty is working on and they have a few concerns. They had sent this review to you last February/March along with current versions of the FSDS, but this information is not reflected in the work that Marty is doing. Please review the information below.

Thanks,

Pat

General issues pertaining to the TAPE forms, as well as some other data management concerns, are summarized below.

FSDSs (the soil and dust forms appear to be a modified version of out-of-date Libby project forms):
1. Data items are not consistent with current forms, some of which is missing and critical (e.g. dust sample sublocations) and some of which are likely not applicable (e.g., Map Location field).
2. Data items are not in the same order as current forms, which may not matter if all data is going to be collected on the PDA; however, this may have QC implications if data is going to be verified in elastic prior to COC production. Is there a proposed QC process once information is stored in the PDA? Also, what if an incorrect address is selected from a pulldown menu? What is the verification process? Need the ability to add or revise an address once in the field.
3. Nomenclature of data items have been changed (e.g., Index ID = Sample ID; Location ID = Sample Point ID). This will ultimately be troublesome for data users and developers alike.
4. Some responses are incorrect (e.g., filter diameters for dust samples are 25mm and 37mm, not .45u and .37u).

Interview for Residents/Employees of Troy, Montana Form:
1. Form doesn't capture the cleanup decision data items found on the Libby IFF. This form will not feed into the RSQ, and property cleanup categories will not be able to be assigned. Nonetheless, if the state wants to capture this information, it would be good to have EPA's input on its potential utility.
2. Many responses are free text rather than pre-defined/standardized answers, which will make querying very difficult.

Troy, MT Inspection Field Form:
1. Until visible vermiculite is deemed "contamination" by EPA, questions related to "visual evidence of contamination" should be reworded "visible evidence of vermiculite".
2. Similar to FSDSs, data items are not consistent with current forms and will ultimately be inconsistent with Libby SIIC/EIC data. Some missing data items may be pertinent to design planning (i.e., wall thicknesses and heights).
3. Similar to FSDSs, data items are not in the same order as current forms, which may or may not have QC implications at Volpe.

Other concerns:
1. elastic enforces many data integrity rules. Will the PDA application (and/or Scribe?) be as robust in

ensuring quality data before exporting to Libby2? For example, elastic pre-populates filter pore size and sample area units for dust samples, greatly increasing data quality and making data entry more efficient.

2. A PDA-based app will need to address the issues that were thought through during handheld development, such as address sync'ing.

3. The site health & safety plan calls for personal air monitoring. A personal air FSDS will need to be developed for use at project startup.

4. Should the visible vermiculite SOP become protocol for pre-designs, Libby/TAPE applications will need to be revised accordingly. We'll want to plan ahead to ensure single-track development.

1/17/2007